

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-24 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 8, 13, and 20 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 8, 13-15, and 20-21 are currently amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In section 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,901,049 to Chapman (hereinafter "Chapman") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,032,197 to Birdwell *et al.* (hereinafter "Birdwell") and U.S. Patent No. 6,300,887 to Le (hereinafter "Le"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claims 1, 8, 13, and 20 have been amended to further define the claimed embodiments of the present invention. Support for the amendment of independent claims 1, 8, 13, and 20 may be found, for example, at paragraphs [0134] and [0194] of the specification of the present patent application.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, among other features, *transmitting rules to enable the CMTS to reconstruct a packet from the cable modem in accordance with the protocol.* Applicants assert that the cited combination of references does not teach or suggest this feature.

Chapman describes a method and apparatus for supporting header suppression and multiple microflows in a network. In Chapman, if header suppression is supported, the correct values are set in a Modem Capability Field. When DSA-REQ or DSC-REQ is initiated, if header suppression is supported, the Header Suppression Configuration settings are included. Chapman, Col. 6, lines 1-5. However, nothing in Chapman teaches or suggests *transmitting rules to enable the CMTS to reconstruct a packet from the cable modem in accordance with the protocol*, as set forth in Applicants' claim 1, as amended.

Moreover, Birdwell and Le do not remedy the deficiencies of Chapman. Thus, Applicants assert that independent claim 1, as amended, is patentable over Chapman, Birdwell, and Le, alone or in any combination.

Applicants further assert that claims 2-7, all of which depend from independent claim 1, are also patentable over Chapman, Birdwell, and Le, alone or in any combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, as amended, and further in view of their own respective features.

Amended independent claim 8 recites, among other features, *receiving rules from the cable modem to enable reconstruction of a packet in accordance with the protocol*. Applicants assert that nothing in the combination of Chapman, Birdwell, and Le teaches or suggests this feature. Thus, Applicants assert that independent claim 8, as amended, is patentable over Chapman, Birdwell, and Le, alone or in any combination.

Applicants further assert that claims 9-12, all of which depend from independent claim 8, are also patentable over Chapman, Birdwell, and Le, alone or in any combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 8, as amended, and further in view of their own respective features.

Amended independent claim 13 recites, among other features, *second means for enabling a processor to transmit rules to enable reconstruction of a packet in accordance with the protocol*. Applicants assert that nothing in the combination of Chapman, Birdwell, and Le teaches or suggests this feature. Thus, Applicants assert that independent claim 13, as amended, is patentable over Chapman, Birdwell, and Le, alone or in any combination.

Applicants further assert that claims 14-19, all of which depend from independent claim 13, are also patentable over Chapman, Birdwell, and Le, alone or in any combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 13, as amended, and further in view of their own respective features.

Amended independent claim 20 recites, among other features, *second means for enabling a processor to receive rules from the cable modem to enable reconstruction of a packet in accordance with the protocol*. Applicants assert that nothing in the combination of Chapman, Birdwell, and Le teaches or suggests this feature. Thus, Applicants assert that independent claim 20, as amended, is patentable over Chapman, Birdwell, and Le, alone or in any combination.

Applicants further assert that claims 21-24, all of which depend from independent claim 20, are also patentable over Chapman, Birdwell, and Le, alone or in any combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 20, as amended, and further in view of their own respective features.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-24.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Robert Sokohl
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 36,013

Date: October 11, 2007

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

712719_2.DOC